

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the communication mailed on February 10, 2009. Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10-30 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 14, and 15 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1, 14, and 15 have been amended and Claims 16-30 have been added. Claims 2-3, 5, and 7-9 have been previously cancelled. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments.

In the communication of February 10, 2009, the grounds of rejection that were reviewed on appeal were:

1. Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, and 12-15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Platte (U.S. Patent No. 4,864,409) in view of Saburi (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,235); and

2. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Platte in view of Saburi and further in view of Vincent (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,122).

The rejection with respect to Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10-15 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites, *inter alia*, as follows:

“...continuously detecting relative movement associated with the hand-held device that tracks the object of interest within a displayed image generated by said camera, the relative movement depending on the tracking of the object of interest...” (emphasis added)

The applied combination of Platte, Saburi, and Vincent fails to teach and/or suggest “...continuously detecting relative movement associated with the hand-held device that tracks the object of interest within a displayed image generated by said camera, the relative movement depending on the tracking of the object of interest,” as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Platte, Saburi, and Vincent, either applied alone or in combination, clearly do not teach and/or suggest tracking an object, where relative movement depends on that tracking of the object.

In contrast, in the present disclosure, as illustrated by the Claims as amended herein, it is explicitly stated, for clarification purposes, that **the relative movement depends on the tracking of the object of interest.**

Independent Claims 14 and 15 include the same or similar limitations to those of Claim 1, and are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to Claims 1, 14, and 15, and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 4, 6, and 10-13, are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claims 1, 14, and 15. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to dependent Claims 4, 6, and 10-13, and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Applicants have further added new Claims 16-30. No new matter has been introduced by the addition of new Claims 16-30. Support for Claims 16-30 can be found throughout the entire specification. Applicants believe that these claims are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and respectfully request the allowance of these claims.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all Claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10-30, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.  
Registration No. 43,600

Date: April 6, 2009

By:   
George Likoufrezos  
Reg. No. 40,067  
Attorney for Applicants  
631-501-5706

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
**Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.**  
**Senior IP Counsel**  
**Philips Electronics North America Corp.**  
**P.O. Box 3001**  
**Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001**  
**Phone: (914) 333-9618**